

## Yet Another Internet Argy-Bargy



Myatt, c. 1996, on a tropical beach

ooo o ooo

### Preface

An anonymous person recently (January 2026) claimed that a book titled *Bealuwes Gast* confirmed outright that David Myatt (DM) is/was Anton Long (AL). The argy-bargy took place on <https://sinisterstudies.substack.com/> where Dr. Chris Giudice has posted informative articles about the O9A.

A respondent disputed the claim and in his, in comparison, brief replies he does not answer all the unfounded allegations made or questions asked such as (a) the allegation "you et al, despite obviously having the document (as you can quote from it) ..." when the respondent simply quoted from an item published several years ago; and (b) the off-topic question about Reichsfolk. Neither did the respondent react to the ad hominem attacks that the claimant introduced into the argy-bargy.

We have kept the original formatting and the in-line URL's and corrected a few obvious typos.

Tau Sigma Omicron  
January 2026

ooo o ooo

### Claims:

I recently acquired excerpts of the book *Bealuwes Gast*, which may be helpful here. I can't comment too much, as even I haven't read the contents yet, but I will be transcribing it in its entirety and uploading it on archive.org very soon (in the next day or two). I will link it to you here when I do. It seems to just outright confirm what everyone already knew, that DL is/was AL

Elsewise, I would heuristically say that the O9A likely grew along with Myatt. Sprouting from his Temple of the Sun and nazi days, it was overtly racist. Over the years, that tempered, and thus so did the O9A, hence the development of the "non-racist" Reichsfolk. He converted to Islam, hence the O9A's anti-Magian stance was diluted to be anti-Judeo-Christian, and the O9A even openly

acknowledges Islamic esoteric influence.

ooo

Response:

As for Bealuwes Gast, you apparently assume it was written by David Myatt whereas it was exposed years ago as a forgery - qv. <https://archive.org/download/diablerie-and-bealuwes-gast/Diablerie-and-Bealuwes-Gast.pdf>

Where are the primary sources for the claim it was written by Myatt? Myatt himself denied writing it in his 2013 essay "A Matter of Honour". The author of "Bealuwes Gast: A Study in Forgery" writes:

<quote> The work begins with an Apologia, signed 'Anton Long 121 Year of Faten', in which the author states: "Balewa; I am and have been wicked. That is, I Am Gray – balanced between, and yet beyond, Light and Dark; a Shade derived from many colours..."

Since the bulk of Bealuwes Gast consists of chapters from an early, 2009, pre-publication draft of Myatt's autobiography *Myngath* – which however differs substantially from the 2013 published version [ISBN 978-1484110744] – then apparently Bealuwes Gast is Myatt's confession that he was, after all, the enigmatic 'Anton Long'. However, on close inspection this confession does not ring true. Firstly and importantly, Bealuwes Gast is truncated, ending around 1999 just after Myatt's conversion to Islam, and thus missing the chapters of *Myngath* dealing with Myatt's development of his 'numinous way' and his post-2006 life and what, by his own admission, is the most important singular event of his life, the suicide of his fiancée in 2006, and which suicide profoundly changed him, led him to reject all extremism and develop his compassionate and mystical philosophy of pathei-mathos whose central virtue is personal humility. Instead, Bealuwes Gast ends with a chapter titled *Conclusion: A Nasty Piece of Work*, in which the author egoistically boasts that "he does not care," that he has "exulted in life" and that he is "a nasty piece of work," all of which statements and sentiments are profoundly at odds with everything Myatt has written post-2006, and in many of which writings he expresses remorse for his decades of extremism.

Thus it seems as if the compiler of Bealuwes Gast has avoided – has had to avoid – dealing with the issues that, for many people, make them reject the allegation that David Myatt is Anton Long: the issues of Myatt's philosophy of pathei-mathos, his rejection of all forms of extremism, his well-documented statement regarding 1970s occult honeytraps, and his voluminous post-2009 writings and letters which express the thoughts of a very human, and un- satanic, person who has 'learnt his lesson' as a result of personal grief.....</quote>

ooo

Claims:

"Primary sources" that you et al already predefine and thus, ideologically manipulate? "Exposed" by you et al some years ago?

If you wish to speak of "primary sources", here is what Chloe Ortega, the (former) holder of the title "Outer Representative of the O9A", has to say in an email to Beast Xeno, called A Brief Hello (2012), a title which you et al seemingly have no claim to (and thus have no comparable institutional legitimacy

as a 'primary source):

"David Myatt wrote BG a couple years ago. There are no intentions behind it. He wrote us [ONA] an underground autobiography which shares the missing details he left out in his public autobiography. You'll see the details has to do with the ONA. Since DM denies being Anton Long in the public arena, he wishes for this to be kept private. DM, the old guards, and myself have been talking since last year about the future of the ONA. We fear that if DM remains a part of the ONA, it may die with him, if ONA is too dependent on DM or if ONA becomes a personality cult. After much talks, it was agreed to have DM cut himself out of ONA history for 40 years [1 generation]. He also agreed to resign or retire from ONA as Anton Long for this reason."

Currently DM in public is erasing his footprints regarding any him and ONA. You must keep in mind that what he says is meant for the generic public and not us. Because of all this BG has to be kept offline and private.

(...)

DM and some of his friends from Shropshire are already claiming BG is an "elaborate hoax" in public. Don't mind them. The thing with DM is that he has this glitch in his personality where he dislikes the average public person, and so he says all sorts of contradicting and untrue things in public, while he stays honest in private. This way it teaches those of us with eyes to see, know that what is written and said in public - especially online - just can't be trusted, especially if it is about a person we may not have any real life connection to and knowledge of."

It is then, perhaps noteworthy that you et al, despite obviously having the document (as you can quote from it) and claiming it to be supposedly derivative of Myngath with ridiculous details, refuse to release it. Surely the easiest way to clear up all of this confusion and to prove your point would just be to release it?

It is also, then, perhaps noteworthy why you et al are so keen to dismiss it, maybe owing to those named "friends from Shropshire claiming BG is an "elaborate hoax""?

Even further yet, it is also, then, perhaps noteworthy that one "Ms PointyHat" in a "Conclusion", writes this?:

"These three ways, woven from the same muliebral thread, and which Myatt has created from his own unique pathei-mathos, are of course Myatt's mystical philosophy the Numinous Way; the esoteric philosophy, and praxis, of The Order of Nine Angles; and the ethical National Socialism of Myatt's Reichsfolk group."

Just some food for thought.

ooo

Response:

Whatever. As David Myatt said in a recent interview with the scholar Aymenn Jawad Al-Tamimi:

<quote>Individuals can either believe what others have said and written and do say or write

about me, or they can do what I consider in my rather old-fashioned way is the honourable, the fair, thing: which is to make their own judgement based on a personal knowing of a person over a period of time or, failing that, accord the person the benefit of the doubt.

My 'side of the story' is expressed in items such as *Myngath* and *A Matter of Honour* with my regret about my extremist, political and religious, past evident in many of my post-2011 writings.</quote>

The interview, and Myatt's review of Aymenn Jawad Al-Tamimi's recent book "Rodrigo Ximénez de Rada's Minor Histories" is at <https://davidmyatt.wordpress.com/2026/01/15/a-2026-interview/>

But no doubt you et al for whatever reasons will continue to believe that DM=AL and use secondary and tertiary sources (and even forgeries) in the process. Which makes me to wonder why in a negative way so many are fixated on DM and why so many especially on social media continue to make accusations about him while hiding their real identity and in a conspiratorial way accuse anyone who defends him as being Myatt using a pseudonym.

BTW it's interesting that you quote the anonymous person 'Chloe Ortega' and repeat her claim she was the 'Outer Representative' of the O9A when as the 2011 'Anton Long' wrote it was a jape - <https://archive.org/download/o9a-outer-rep-jape/o9a-outer-rep-jape.pdf>

It's also interesting that (i) you accuse DM of "erasing his footprints regarding [...] him and ONA. You must keep in mind that what he says is meant for the generic public and not us" and (ii) without evidence seem to believe, as some do, that his post-2011 writings are a deception. The term conspiracy theory again comes to mind.

You also keep quoting anonymous people using pseudonyms (such as PointyHat) as if their usually Internet based words re the O9A and Myatt were gospel when they almost always are just personal opinions.

ooo

Claims:

Quite a juvenile error to claim that I am accusing DM of those things. As is clear in the text if you were to read it, such claims are coming from Chloe Ortega, in an email she sent to Beast Xeno, titled "A Brief Hello" circa 2012. To make things simple for you et al and whatever ramblings you may conjure from this exchange, my text begins at "It is, then, perhaps (...)"

"Secondary sources" on your et al's accounts, "tertiary sources" on your et al's accounts, and similarly "forgeries" on your et al's accounts. You seem to love doing this neat rhetorical trick where you say something as purely opinion, and then in the future use said opinion as though it were fact.

Your definitions of "primary sources" are ideologically contaminated. It is not neutral scholarship to self-reference your texts and implicitly suggest they are factual/settled areas. Ironically enough, your et al's arguments are, by your own definitions, not primary sources and thus cannot be used in any binding or authoritative way. Ignoring the obvious issues therein too, such as AL eschewing authority, and thus "primary sources" as a notion itself is problematic and does not exist in the original corpus.

Note also, that I do not claim you are Anton Long/David Myatt. When I say "you et al", it is in reference to your cronies of the "Seven Oxonians". I would wager that you have no similar reason to use "et al" in reference to me as I am a lone operative, though it is a neat rhetorical flourish. You also love to speak of pseudonymous persons spewing their opinions, despite you being of the exact same ilk. Why do you not show yourself if you are so against this use of pseudonyms, if you are so bold?

It is very interesting to me that you evaded your ownership of the texts, and why you refused to publish them. It's also very interesting to me that you did not critique my previous points about national socialism's role in aeonics/clioligy, despite seemingly disagreeing with my points given your first comment.

Re: Outer Representative being a jape, labyrinthos mythologicus is my only response. AL's words are, explicitly by him, not to be trusted. What is your rationale for assuming he must have been telling the truth there? Reichsfolk has a similar post of outer representative, is that a jape?

ooo

Response:

My first point is you keep referencing the opinions of anonymous person who have posted stuff on the Internet. Second, I am asking you to provide scholarly sources. Third, sure I also reference the opinions of anonymous persons who have posted stuff on the Internet so that the few interested in this argy-bargy can read alternative views and form their own opinion. Fourth, please try to refrain from ad hominems.

Fifth, you make assumptions about motives both in regard to DM and AL, as in "AL's words are, explicitly by him, not to be trusted" and as in DM is "erasing his footprints regarding [...] him and ONA." What evidential proof do you have regarding such allegations and what 'footprints' do you claim DM is erasing? An awful lot of ONA stuff from after 2009 is archived via the 'wayback machine' as in the 'nineangles wordpress blog' - and as in <https://web.archive.org/web/20110223215257/http://www.nineangles.info/> - so any attempt to erase stuff is pointless.

Sixth, you like so many seem to assume without evidential proof that DM=AL. Seventh, your understanding of primary sources seems to be flawed. So, how do you define them? FYI, an interesting overview is provided in the 2023 text "Fairness, Fallacies, And The Cræft Of Research."

ooo

Claims:

Firstly (and thirdly), you et al are yourselves 'anonymous persons' who post stuff on the internet. As I said, if you are so against this, why do you not show yourself? Methinks it is a double standard, no? Rules for thee but not for me?

Second, you asked for "primary sources", it is goalpost shifting to now ask for "scholarly sources". I have given you an insider account. How that is not "primary", I fail to see. Beyond that, I would wager that you et al would be unable to provide "scholarly sources" for your claims that are not self-recursive in some way (i.e your et al's works, or works you et al have directly had a hand in).

Fifthly, as I said exactly in my last comment, I am not making any claims about David Myatt's "erasing



his footprints", that is from Chloe Ortega. A quick Google search would show you exactly the email I am talking about, that you repeatedly assert I am making the claim is very telling. As per Anton Long, see below:

"I quite naturally over the past four decades have indulged in some exoteric rhetoric as well as in some diabolical incitement, to disaffection, or whatever. Those who can distinguish between exoteric and esoteric - between causal forms and sinister-numinous emanations, can; while those who lack the faculties esoteric or otherwise to so distinguish, are the kind of people who get trapped in our Labyrinthos Mythologicus."

Sixthly, the "evidence" is exactly from Chloe, as mentioned before, as well as Bealuwes Gast which I now have access to. Yet again, it is interesting to me that you deflect from you et al not releasing said document, and that you do not critique my statements re: aeonics/cliology and national socialism.

Seventhly, ignoring yet another instance of your et al's self recursion, as I said, "primary sources" in general are problematic for the O9A because it was designed to be "a living, changing, evolving, long-living entity", and which "no one (...) can control or own". It is not a religion with a defined doctrine or clear 'prophets', it was designed to change, to mutate, and thus any accurate definition must keep this in mind.

Hence then, as I have told you et al before, if "primary sources" are to be used at all, it cannot be limited to just AL. It should extend to anyone who has significantly altered that "living, changing (...) entity", because it then becomes a "primary source", or an insider account. At a minimum, IMO, this naturally encompasses AL, anyone who has held the title of "Outer Representative", as well as the "Inner O9A", but more realistically it should also cover people like Magister Hagur, ABG Lodge, and Ryan Anschauung.

ooo

Response:

Firstly, I my apologies to Dr. Chris Giudice for the length of my replies.

As for me being anonymous I have never claimed to be otherwise as you would have discovered if you had done a search on google. The difference is I do not, or try not to, make unfounded accusations about living persons who are public figures such as Myatt, but instead sometimes try to present "the other side of the story" as I am here. Of course like many I have an opinion about some public figures, such as The Vulgarian, based on what they publicly do and have done or plan to do.

The opinions and beliefs of anonymous people like Ortega are just their opinions and beliefs and are not evidence, primary or evidential as in a Court of Law. BTW, scholarly evidence and primary sources are the same thing since correctly defined a scholar in the traditional sense is someone who has acquired a profound knowledge gained by individual study of primary sources which:

<quote> include contemporaneous manuscripts, letters, diaries, memoirs, personal journals, interviews, speeches, and other materials individuals used to describe (i) events in which they were participants or observers, and (ii) ideas or creations - such as a philosophy, music, literature, or art-work - which they were responsible for. Hence in the matter of a philosophy such as that of Heidegger the primary sources are his published writings, authenticated recordings or transcriptions of his

speeches/lectures, and authenticated unpublished manuscripts if any. The writings, opinions, and conclusions of others about that philosophy, and other translations of his work, are secondary sources, with compilations of quotations from such secondary sources, a tertiary source [...] </quote>

One attribute of a scholar is that they are able to read primary sources in their original language and thus do not rely on the interpretations/translations of others.

You wrote you're not making claims re Myatt "erasing his footprints", etcetera, yet you are publicly repeating without evidence claims by an anonymous person without balancing it with "the other side of the story". It amounts at least according to my understanding to hearsay and is not evidential.

As for primary sources in relation to AL and the O9A it depends on how one defines the O9A (e.g. an esoteric philosophy developed by the original Anton Long or a loose association of individuals sharing similar beliefs who self identify with either the pre-1992 writings of Anton Long or the post-1992 writings) and what constitutes 'being O9A' and thus whether the pre-internet ONA was different from the post-1992 O9A. The matter is discussed in "Unravelling The ONA" where the sources used by academics such as Daveed Gartenstein-Ross and co-author, and Shanon Shah and co-authors, are discussed. These are scholarly issues which require research. As Daveed Gartenstein-Ross wrote: <quote> "they give Long's texts more weight than those of others because his writings are repeatedly referenced by O9A texts as the foundation of the philosophy." </quote>

There is also the question of whether the post-1992 writings were by the "original Anton Long" or by others using that identity. Again, primary sources need to be found and researched. To blandly state, for example, that Bealuwes Gast was written by the original Anton Long and is proof that DM=AL because some individuals (anonymous or otherwise) claim or believe it was and is amounts, in my opinion, to hearsay, often spread these days via the Internet.

Perhaps we should now agree to disagree.

ooo

Claims:

I did not claim that you had claimed to be not anonymous. My claim is that you critique others for being anonymous, despite being yourself an anonymous person, and citing other anonymous persons. As I have told you et al before, I have zero care for, or regard for, victim mentality re: "the other side". It is also rather ironic that you claim an opinion about "The Vulgarian" (Trump IIRC) despite failing the criteria of personal knowledge of someone that you et al are so fond of claiming is necessary to pass judgement.

So we are now shifting the goal posts from "primary sources", then to "scholarly", and now to what would uphold in a court? "Hearsay" in a legalistic sense is irrelevant re: primary sources, what matters is if the source is made by someone within/during something is taking place, which very well may be hearsay. Similarly, you seem to misunderstand what it means to be "scholarly".

A primary source is not, by itself, scholarly. It may be of scholarly interest, however. It is perhaps worth noting that, by your own definitions, if "primary source" is synonymous with "scholarly source", Dr Monette and his work (that you et al are so fond of mentioning) would not be "scholarly", as it is not itself a primary source. Ignoring (for now) your referencing of your et al's own manuscripts, the

example of Heidegger is blaringly misplaced. Heidegger's philosophy indeed may be contained by primary sources originating from Heidegger, because as "Heidegger's philosophy" would suggest, it is the personal philosophy of Heidegger.

Anton Long deliberately eschews that, he claims the O9A cannot be contained by one individual. To claim he is the only source of "primary sources" is, then, to ignore the very "primary sources" you define, as they actively contradict your framing. I am under no obligation to present "the other side of the story" (which you seem to interpret as being your et al's own personal views). Much as critiquing holocaust denial does not need to be 'balanced' by suggesting the potential validity of holocaust denial, it is simply an unfounded assertion to say that an argument must be 'balanced' by somehow validating or acknowledge other arguments. The article you mentioned is perhaps the pinnacle of your et al's self recursion. The academics you cite themselves cite the "TWS Nexion", as well as one "Rachael Stirling", and "Monette".

You are also so bold as to cite your own work as definitive yet again when I specifically asked you for authors that are not you et al to prove your point. That you have failed to do so indicates enough already. Even if we are to take such academics at their word, their phrasing is "more weight", not "absolute weight" or something similar, and thus reducing primary sources as you et al do to being just AL seems unsupported by these academics. "Primary sources" have already been addressed above. "Agree to disagree"? I think not.

If you wish to stop responding, you may opt to do so. Quite bluntly we are not playing the same game, and I won't settle for the equivocation that such a thing would necessitate. If you et al wish to spread your propaganda, and to chum up to others and discredit me (re: "At last, an 'outsider' understands. There really is nothing more to say except 'thank you'", plus attempts to tone police me), I will be here to criticise you in turn. Stop responding to me if you dislike that.

Response:

Indicative claims in what IMO is an indicative argy-bargy re the question of DM=AL.

(1) Victim mentality? So, striving to, as fairness suggests, present "the other side of the story" - in this case the question of DM=AL - is an example of s/c victim mentality?

(2) You wrote that I am "failing the criteria of personal knowledge of someone that you et al are so fond of claiming is necessary to pass judgement." Where have I said/claimed that? I quoted DM's views, not mine. Perhaps you are suggesting I am DM?

(3) You wrote: "It is not neutral scholarship to self-reference your texts." What texts of mine? My texts in relation to DM and the ONA/O9A - such as "A Question Of Honour And Personal Knowing" - do not pretend to be scholarly as you seem to suggest but are just my attempt to present "the other side of the story" by quoting what DM has written.

(4) You wrote that I "seem to misunderstand what it means to be scholarly." I quoted what someone had written about what is scholarly, in my probably feeble attempt to present "the other side of the story" and perhaps provide some balance to the question of DM=AL.

(5) You wrote that I am "so bold as to cite your own work as definitive." What work and where did I say



it was definitive? I refer you to item (3) above.

(6) BTW, you still have not answered questions such as what is your definition of a primary source.

(7) You wrote of my attempts to 'tone police' you. Suffice to say I will let those of a rational and/or or of a scholarly disposition draw their own conclusions.

(8} It is possibly indicative that you and others who believe that DM=AL have failed to scholarly comment on DM's post-2011 writings and items such as his 2003 autobiographical short story "One Connexion".

To conclude: the question of DM=AL apparently has become an emotive one for many and which question may in a scholarly way now or (most probably) in the future some accredited academics can provide some rational answers to.

Meanwhile, the argy-bargy about it, via social media or otherwise, will no doubt continue. As Myatt was fond of quoting:

ἔστι δ' ὅπη νῦν ἔστι: τελεῖται δ' ἐς τὸ πεπρωμένον: οὐθ' ὑποκαίων οὐθ' ὑπολείβων οὔτε  
δακρύων ἀπύρων ἱερῶν ὀργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει

ooo

## Conclusion

An indicative argy-bargy given the numerous allegations made for nearly two decades that DM=AL. Indicative of the way many believers in and propagandists of the DM=AL equation present their case.

We draw the attention of the few readers who may be interested in such matters as DM=AL to three works relevant to the argy-bargy:

(i) Fairness, Fallacies, And The Cræft Of Research, <https://archive.org/download/fairness-fallacies-1/fairness-fallacies-v1.pdf>

(ii) Allegations And A Modern Narrative, [https://archive.org/download/allegations\\_and\\_a\\_modern\\_narrative/allegations\\_and\\_a\\_modern\\_narrative.pdf](https://archive.org/download/allegations_and_a_modern_narrative/allegations_and_a_modern_narrative.pdf)

(iii) Deconstructing A Mythos, <https://archive.org/download/gelis-3/gelis-3.pdf>